WHAT'S IN STORE FOR MANKIND

Georgi SHAKHNAZAROV

Novosti Press Agency Publishing House

WHAT'S IN STORE FOR MANKIND

Georgi
SHAKHNAZAROV

Novosti Press Agency Publishing House
Moscow 1984

Translated from the Russian by Arkadi ILLARIONOV
Translation edited by Sheena WAKEFIELD

0303020000

© Novosti Press Agency Publishing House 1984
Editing completed on August 8, 1984

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 6

MAY NUCLEAR MIDNIGHT NEVER COME 8

- Death to Death 10
- The Sin of Knowledge? 17
- Death of War? 26
- Mutual Deterrence 34
- On Sovereignty and World Government 39
- With Love and Fear 45

THIS BRAVE NEW WORLD IN THAT NOTORIOUS NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR 51

- Controlled Life 53
- Reason Turned Upside Down 59
- An Attempt to Understand the Changing World? 63
- 1984 the Way It Is 68
- Forecasts, Forecasts ... 82

INTRODUCTION

All aspects of social life and international relations are changing radically before the eyes of the present generations and with their active involvement, under the influence of two great revolutions—the socialist revolution and the technological revolution. The age-old systems of the oppression of man by man and nation by nation, which seemed unshakeable, are crumbling. New forms of social being and consciousness are emerging. Boundless vistas of progress are opening up to mankind, astounded by its own power. This age of great change gives birth to great expectations, a belief that reason can help create a kingdom of justice and universal prosperity on earth.

However, the future does not only give hope, it is fraught with many dangers too. The forces of reaction, frantically clinging to their privileges, threaten to turn the remarkable fruits of science and invention against man. The released energy of the atom is to them first of all a weapon of mass destruction, electronics is a way of manipulating human consciousness, and genetic engineering is a tool for modifying human nature to produce obedient live robots. Added to these evil intentions are objective difficulties. The present generations have

to deal with the complicated heritage of the cruel social order of exploitation that dominated the world for thousands of years: crying inequality in the development of different countries and regions, areas of famine, poverty and illiteracy. The uncontrolled use of natural resources means that they may be exhausted. The imperialist-inspired arms race means that mankind has to confront the most burning issue, one of saving the human race from a nuclear apocalypse.

Small wonder therefore that people look to the future with fear as well as with hope. Some are seeking to speed up the march of events, others want to slow it down. Some applaud innovations, others disapprove of them. These varied, sometimes directly opposite, attitudes to the future stem largely from gnoseological and even psychological factors. The extreme complexity and confusion of the social, sectional and individual problems linked with them require a correct interpretation, sufficient knowledge, unbiased judgement and, in some respects, a break with traditional views rooted in a given social environment. The different reactions to change described as "future shock" also reflect such human qualities as optimistic or pessimistic perception of reality.

However, most of the argument about the future has a class origin, of course. In fact it is a historical dispute between those classes and social groups which are stepping into their heritage of the world and those who want at all costs to preserve the old ways which benefit them and carry them over to the 21st century. It is an acute, bitter and uncompromising battle for millions of people, whose actions determine the course of world events.

Ideological polemics reflecting the interests, goals and aspirations of the conflicting classes is develop-

ing over a very wide range of economic, social and political problems facing both individual nations and the international community as a whole. Two cardinal problems are now the subject of particularly close attention. They concern both every nation and every individual as well. The first is the problem of peace, that is, whether mankind will survive. And the other is the prospect for society's development, that is, what kind of society it is going to be. We are going to examine both problems proceeding from books that evoked a good deal of comment when they were published and that continue to remain at the centre of discussion about the future.

MAY NUCLEAR MIDNIGHT NEVER COME

The very phrase "the nuclear danger" sounds like a warning bell. There is no subject more simple and yet at the same time more complex. It should be clear to everyone, it would seem, that if another world war with the use of nuclear missiles breaks out, our planet will be engulfed by nuclear fires in which the human race will burn and there will not even be anyone left to pick up the ashes. But is it clear? Does everybody realise that the threat looming over mankind has multiple and different causes? Some of them are on the surface and easily discernible, others, lying much deeper, are hidden from view. They are rooted in the economy, politics, ideology, social and national consciousness, and human mentality. It is no simple thing to spotlight them with the torch of science, separate them from one another, arrange them in order of importance, and put them on public display. To make matters worse, the true picture is confused by all sorts of falsifications, both deliberate and unintentional, stemming from a narrow view of things and class bias, from a selfish interpretation of the circumstances and egoism.

The nuclear danger is the most serious and painful problem of our time to which no one can be in-

different. It is a many-sided problem because it has military-strategic, technological, economic, ecological, historical and psychological aspects. Most of all, however, it is a political and philosophical problem. It is from this point of view that the American journalist Jonathan Schell examines it in his recently published book *The Fate of the Earth*. It is this book that we are going to take as a basis for our reflections.

Why did I choose that particular book? Hundreds and thousands of writings on the subject have been published over the four decades since that fatal moment when an atomic mushroom cloud enveloped Hiroshima. They have included works of fiction, journalism, science, and science fiction. Literary historians have every reason to speak about the emergence of a new, independent "atomic" trend. Like any other type of literature, it already has its own masterpieces and cheap paperbacks, revelations and banalities, works imbued with lofty humanism and cannibalistic ravings.

The "atomic library" has been growing particularly rapidly in recent years. In the West thick volumes are coming off the press one after another; their authors describe in detail the destructive power of nuclear weapons, count their stockpiles, speculate on the probable consequences of their use, and analyse the extent of the danger in the light of the prevailing military and political doctrines. If we disregard their tone, they contain far more information than the modest and even somewhat amateurish book by Jonathan Schell. They sound much more fundamental and scientific, at any rate.

Yet my choice fell on his book, primarily because it reveals concern for the life of humanity and reflections on its future. In short, it is both a confession and a sermon of an atomic age pac-

ifist. This is how the average American and, to a degree, the resident of any other industrialised capitalist country, must feel and think. To understand the way of thinking of the average person is no less and perhaps even more important than to understand the motives of those whose fingers hover over the push buttons of nuclear war.

Death to Death

Schell begins by describing the dimensions of the nuclear threat. Unlike some other Western authors who savour the details of the nuclear apocalypse, he does this with a heavy heart. Schell even apologises to the reader, saying that he doesn't want to frighten him, but that he must know the facts in order to visualise yet again the total nature of nuclear weapons.

People have been waging wars for several thousand years now, but everything they have known so far, including the bloody world wars, cannot be compared with the probable consequences of the large-scale use of nuclear weapons. The creation of such weapons was a gigantic leap in man's ability to destroy his own kind both from the quantitative and the qualitative points of view. If we take the destructive power or lethality of arms, the switch from ordinary explosives to the sudden release of the latent energy of matter is equivalent to the revolution in the art of war that the invention of gunpowder brought about. The atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima had an explosive force of 12,500 tons of TNT. All the explosives used in World War II were equivalent in their destructive potential to just a few dozen hydrogen bombs of 20 and more megatons.

As for the qualitative aspect of the matter, while most conventional bombs have only one cause of damage—a blast wave, the explosion of a nuclear weapon produces a number of effects hitherto unknown: thermal radiation, nuclear radiation and electromagnetic pulse. All these phenomena, affecting the area adjacent to the site of explosion, also have countless secondary effects disastrous both for man and the environment. There is also a qualitative difference here, depending on whether we are talking about individual nuclear blasts or the simultaneous use of all the stocks of weapons of mass destruction. In the first case the ecosphere might perhaps be able to heal the wounds inflicted on it. In the latter case, however, local effects grow into global ones which will lead to the destruction of man's environment during a shorter or longer period. Plant life will be killed. The temperature of the earth's surface will drop. The ozone layer in the stratosphere will be destroyed. Water bodies and soil will be contaminated with radioactive fallout. This is bound to result in unpredictable cataclysms in comparison with which present-day earthquakes, floods and other natural calamities will seem mere child's play.

Let me make a comparison with a person who has managed to escape from a fire. If burns cover more than half of his skin, he is practically beyond hope. A nuclear holocaust threatens the whole of humankind with the same; even if a few pockets of life were to survive in some areas not affected directly by hostilities, the survivors would be doomed to gradual extinction.

Schell quotes experts' opinions, adds his own judgments and comes to the conclusion that another world war with the use of nuclear weapons

would spell the end of the human race. This is hardly a major discovery, the reader may say; it is no great achievement in our age of availability of scientific and technological information to acknowledge things that must be clear to all and sundry. This is so, but we must remember that the probable consequences of a general nuclear conflict remain a subject of heated debate in the West—and the question is answered in more than one way.

It is not hard to see what this means. If a nuclear world war threatens everyone with death, anyone who might risk using nuclear weapons would be acting like a Japanese Kamikaze pilot deliberately seeking his own death in order to destroy the enemy. Victory, the main object of any military campaign, becomes unattainable. The war-like ancient Romans used to say "Vae victis!" meaning "Woe to the vanquished!" As far as a nuclear conflict is concerned, you can't even say woe both to the victors and the vanquished because there will be neither. Hence the conclusion that a nuclear holocaust should not be allowed to happen at all. There are no objectives that might justify the extinction of the human race. Of course, there are lofty ideas for which people may and can sacrifice their lives, but the whole point is that the loftiness and nobility of those ideas stem from a desire to benefit one's neighbours, one's own nation, the whole of mankind, to make life better. There is no idea that might justify unleashing a nuclear war which spells collective suicide. More than that, it would not only be suicide, but also homicide, if we bear in mind the future generations whose fate wholly depends on us.

Of course, our descendants do not yet exist in the flesh, but the American author is quite correct

when he underlines our responsibility to posterity. We could add to his reasoning that concern for the continuation of the human race, stemming from a biological function and a consciously realised moral duty, is dictated, among other things, by vital practical interests. Reason is a unique gift of nature which places man above all other living things, but it can only realise itself in a chain of generations replacing one another and passing on to one another the accumulated wealth of civilisation. Since each generation adds to it by its own labour and experience, thus making it common wealth, the latter belongs equally to us, and to our descendants. They do not yet exist, but we already interact with them, preparing to hand over to them the fruits of our work, our unsolved problems, and the care of our memory. This is the only way to conquer time and extend our existence well beyond the short span of human life.

What is all the genius of Shakespeare without people to read his sonnets or see his tragedies on the stage? What are Michelangelo's *David* or Beethoven's *Moonlight Sonata* worth without today's viewers and listeners? Is Dostoyevsky's revelation of the human soul any good if there is no one to learn moral lessons from it?

But let us get back to Schell. He observes that an individual will have a wrong idea of the nuclear danger if he tries to understand it chiefly from the point of view of a threat to himself or to those close to him. It is a threat to life first and foremost, "not at the level of individuals, who already live under the sway of death, but at the level of everything that individuals hold in common." [1] Death ends life, sends everyone born into

[1] Jonathan Schell, *The Fate of the Earth*, N.Y., 1982, p. 117.

non-existence, but nuclear destruction turns everyone into nothing at one go and puts an end to birth itself.

Reflections on the individual and the universal bring Schell to the following idea. There are, evidently, people in the world who might think like this: we are all mortal and so what difference does it make whether we settle our scores with life at different times or in company with all the rest? You only die once. So why worry about it too much? In the meantime, let us live, and we shall see what will happen.

Indeed, if we were to conduct a worldwide survey and guarantee the full anonymity of statements, we would be sure to find a certain number of cynics indifferent not only to the fate of the human race, but also to that of their kith and kin. Moreover, the supercynics might even say that they would be glad to leave this sinful world in company with others, not alone. This, however, is one of those cases when it is safe to say even without a survey that the cynics make up a mere fraction of the world's population of many millions.

There is another view, however, much more widespread and therefore more dangerous. The author describes it the following way: "When one tries to face the nuclear predicament, one feels sick, whereas when one pushes it out of mind, as apparently one must do most of the time in order to carry on with life, one feels well again. But this feeling of well-being is based on a denial of the most important reality of our time, and therefore is itself a kind of sickness. A society that systematically shuts its eyes to an urgent peril to its physical survival and fails to take any steps to save itself cannot be called psychologically well. In effect, whether we think about nuclear

weapons or avoid thinking about them, their presence among us makes us sick, and there seems to be little of a purely mental or emotional nature that we can do about it." [1]

Irrespective of whether we take this view for an ordinary defensive reaction without which it is impossible to live, whether we regard it as a cowardly reluctance to face danger or, finally, whether we see it as careless optimism typical of human nature, such moods do exist. What is happening? Is mankind really moving towards its death because it has been too presumptuous, incapable of harmonising its own power with the forces of nature, because it lacks a sense of self-preservation, or simply because the hour has come for it to pay for its sins?

There is, incidentally, such a view. Schell notes that some Christian fundamentalists believe that nuclear war will come as "the Armageddon threatened by God in the Bible". He objects and says that "extinction by nuclear arms would not be the Day of Judgment, in which God destroys the world, but raises the dead and then metes out perfect justice to everyone who has ever lived; it would be the utterly meaningless and completely unjust destruction of mankind by men. To imagine that God is guiding our hand in this action would quite literally be the ultimate evasion of our responsibility as human beings." [2]

In search of a rationalist explanation of the predicament of modern society, the American author turns to Freud's theories. In the final section of his work *Civilisation and Its Discontents* published in 1930 the founder of psychoanalysis debated

---

[1] Schell, p. 14.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 127.

the fatal question of whether civilisation would help people to overcome the disorders of their way of life, their coexistence, born of the instinct of aggression and self-destruction inherent in man. People had brought the forces of nature under their control to such an extent that with their aid they could easily kill one another down to the last man. They realised that and hence, to a considerable extent, their anxiety, sense of alarm and unhappiness. The only hope was that the other of the two "Heavenly Powers", eternal Eros, would try to assert himself in the fight against his equally immortal rival (Death). But who could predict what would be the outcome of that fight?

According to Schell, Freud realised that in the conflict between the animal, the instinctive, the base in man, which had always been regarded by religion and philosophy as destructive, and the lofty and rational the scales tipped in favour of the latter. At present the greatest danger to man and mankind comes not from a raving, unchecked instinct, but from the expansion of reason which suppresses this instinct. The animal features have been and remain a source of many horrors, but in the final analysis they are incapable of destroying the human race, on the contrary they are the source of the sense of self-preservation. It is omnipotent reason, disregarding the primitive instincts and convincing man that he is total master of his existence and of nature, that has brought him to the present ominous crossroads of destiny.

It is obvious that Schell tries to make Freud's ideas suit his own concept. Freud did not reduce everything to the opposition of instincts to reason. On the contrary, he saw contradictions laid by nature in the instincts: some of them, such as

love, were a source of life, others, such as hatred, led to death. Freud did not accuse reason of providing people with a means of committing collective suicide. He only wondered whether "cultural development" (i.e. reason) would have time to rise to such heights as to eliminate hostility and antagonism born, in his view, of passion. One can discourse as much as one likes on whether Sigmund Freud was right or wrong (after all, the fight between Eros and Death is more of a literary image than a scientific concept), but it is obviously wrong to make him an ally in condemning reason.

So why did Schell enlist the support of such an authority? The point is that he believes that all evil comes from the excessive claims of the human mind. In his words, everything happens according to the Bible. When Adam and Eve tasted the fruit of the tree of knowledge, God punished them by depriving them of the privilege of immortality and condemning them and their offspring to death. Man has now partaken even more of the fruits of the tree of knowledge and has thus brought himself face to face with a second death, the death of all of mankind.

The Sin of Knowledge!

Since we are dealing with a question of principle—who is responsible for the nuclear danger?—I should like to allow myself to give two more brief quotations from Schell's book. "The fundamental origin of the peril of human extinction by nuclear arms," he observes, "lies not in any particular social or political circumstances of our time but in the attainment by mankind as a

whole, after millennia of scientific progress, of certain level of knowledge of the physical un verse." [1] In another place he notes: "It is fundi mental to the shape and character of the nucle predicament that its origins lie in scientific knov ledge rather than in social circumstances. Revol tions born in the laboratory are to be sharply di tinguished from revolutions born in society. S cial revolutions are usually born in the minds millions. . . . they usually cannot occur unless the are widely understood by and supported by t public. By contrast, scientific revolutions usuall take shape quietly in the minds of a few me under cover of the impenetrability to most la men of scientific theory, and thus catch the wor by surprise." [2]

Since the level of the knowledge attained is r garded as the main source of the nuclear dange this inevitably leads to a number of logical co clusions, and Schell draws them. The fir is that once this danger has arisen, it is impo sible ever to get rid of it. There is no way pushing knowledge out of people's minds or r turning physics to the Newtonian, pre-Einsteini age. Any scientific discovery is like any other di covery: when Columbus discovered America a told the world about it, there was no way "undiscovering" it again.

No spaceship can fly you away from knowledg just as it cannot fly you away from yoursel Wherever people may go, they will always tal along the knowledge of how to release energy fro mass and how to make the atom bomb.

But if there is no salvation in the past or beyo the earth, perhaps it may be found in the futur

[1] Schell, p. 100.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 100-101.

thanks to the same scientific and technological progress? Alas, Schell says, there is no hope here either. It is unlikely that an anti-missile or a magnetic trap will be discovered to render nuclear weapons harmless. On the contrary, throughout the ages the scientific revolution has inevitably helped to increase the destructive power of weapons.

Schell, however, is not quite right here. The power of knowledge can be used for different purposes. It is quite conceivable that technological thought will help to create defence systems more powerful than the present nuclear offensive systems. However, it would be just a transient episode in the age-old rivalry between sword and shield, between gun and armour. It may, incidentally, not even be a result of competition between offensive and defensive schools of thought in the arms race. The progress of science itself opens up spheres of the interaction of the forces of nature and gives us methods of control over them, which can always be used against man given somebody's evil intentions. It has always been like that, beginning with the taming of fire, which brought great benefits and countless disasters to man at the same time. In particular it is like that now, at a time when we have begun to discover the mysteries of the microworld, penetrate the living cell and create an artificial brain. Wherever evil intentions are combined with the latest scientific discoveries, there is a real possibility that the lethality of weapons may be increased. Chemical, biological, electronic and laser weapons of mass destruction, to mention just a few, are weapons that can compete with nuclear arms even in the last decades of the 20th century and, very probably, even surpass them by a large margin.

It should be pointed out that while one might

agree with practically all the conclusions Schell draws from his basic tenet, one can never agree with the tenet itself.

To show the inherent untenability of the idea put forward by the American author, let us take it to its logical conclusion. If we are to believe that human knowledge is to blame for everything, we should blame the casualties of the endless wars of the 17th-19th centuries on Nicolaus Copernicus, Galileo Galilei, Johannes Kepler, Rene Descartes, Mikhail Lomonosov, Isaac Newton and other geniuses whose work laid the theoretical foundations of physics, chemistry, astronomy, geography and other sciences. The art of war has always depended on the development of the fundamental branches of science. Without it no headway would have been possible in shipbuilding, fortification, metallurgy, the manufacture of explosives and other areas. Accordingly, Michael Faraday, Hermann von Helmholtz, James Maxwell, Rudolf Diesel, Wilbur and Orville Wright, Alexander Popov and Thomas Edison, to say nothing of other luminaries of science and invention, should be held "responsible" for the suffering and losses of the European nations in both world wars. As for nuclear war, it is crystal clear that the pioneers of the atomic age should be put in the dock—if there is anyone left to try them.

Naturally, no one is going to absolve those scientists who deliberately put themselves and their creative endeavour at the service of an evil cause of responsibility. This is one of the eternal subjects which has now become particularly topical. However, we are concerned here not with the moral responsibility of individual scientists but with the place of science in mankind's cultural and material life. From this point of view to blame

knowledge for the unreasonable and criminal abuse of it would be as unfair as it would be dangerous, because this attitude enables the true culprit to avoid responsibility.

Nevertheless, is there not some truth in the statement that if there was no knowledge there wouldn't be any threat of annihilation? If Dmitri Mendeleyev had not discovered the periodic table of the elements, if Sir Joseph John Thomson had not devised his model of the atom, if Antoine Becquerel had not discovered radioactivity, if Pierre and Marie Curie had not discovered radium, if Sir Ernest Rutherford had not modelled the atomic nucleus, if Albert Einstein had not deduced the formula $E=mc^2$, if Niels Bohr had not developed the theory of atomic structure, if Sir James Chadwick had not discovered the neutron, and if Enrico Fermi had not used neutrons to bombard the nucleus, there would be no nuclear bomb now. You see how simple it all is?

It is said, however, that simplicity is worse than robbery. As soon as you build such a mental chain, the absurdity of the attempt to blame science for criminal thoughts and actions is obvious. There has been a destructive aspect to everything man has created since his first steps as an intelligent creature. The invention of the sling for throwing stones was of great help to him in hunting wild animals, but at the same time it gave him a weapon against his neighbour. The same could be said of the knife, the arrow and even the wheel. The latter wonderful invention revolutionised the productive forces, but was used with equal success in war carts and chariots, that is, it benefited not only the thrifty Hermes but also the war-like Ares. So, whatever we take, almost any progress in thought in very different branches of knowledge,

which might seem far removed from war, worked in two ways and could be used both for good and for evil purposes. Most often it was used both ways.

No, we cannot blame knowledge for the sin which is entirely the result of imperfect social structure, of the division of people into masters and slaves, into oppressors and oppressed. Every living thing can kill itself. Whales throw themselves on to the shore when the ocean can no longer meet their needs. Turtles kill themselves on Pacific atolls because they are threatened with slow death anyway after nuclear tests. So the only "sin" committed by science is that it has made possible universal and not individual killing. But even this "sin" is relative. Wasn't the same done without any intervention of science, even though on a smaller scale? How much scientific knowledge did the Nazis need to gas the inmates of their concentration camps? Was that so very different from smoke killing successfully used as far back as the early Middle Ages?

We might approach the matter from another side. Let us imagine that from the very beginning society developed along more reasonable lines—without private ownership, class divisions, etc. Incidentally, philosophers and historians have often argued among themselves about whether development through antagonisms is essential for social progress or whether in different natural conditions (if we assume the existence of extraterrestrial civilisation) progress could take place without any form of antagonism. The question remains open, unavoidably, because we are talking about what we do not know and what we cannot know, at least in our time.

However, everyone is free to make an assumption. So, how would a society free from class anta-

gonisms and national hatred from the outset perceive and apply scientific discoveries? The answer lies on the surface. It would not even occur to anyone to use them against man for the simple reason that there would be no cause to do so. People kill one another not because they suddenly find a knife or a pistol close to hand. On the contrary, these tools of murder are made especially because people have reasons to kill their own kind.

Here we shall have to examine yet another argument. The point is that Schell, seeing the original source of the nuclear danger in the progress of knowledge, uses the authority of science itself, in the person of such a prominent figure as the English philosopher Bertrand Russell, to back up his view. Speaking in the House of Lords on the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, Russell said that "the question is a simple one: Is it possible for a scientific society to continue to exist, or must such a society inevitably bring itself to destruction? It is a simple question but a very vital one. I do not think it is possible to exaggerate the gravity of the possibilities of evil that lie in the utilisation of atomic energy".

With all due respect to one of the outstanding thinkers of this century we must say, however, that Russell's formulation of the question was not quite right because he failed to specify what kind of society he had in mind. If he meant mankind that had just emerged from the flames of World War II, mankind divided into opposing social systems and burdened by a host of extremely acute antagonisms in which one could already discern the seeds of future conflicts, then his comparison was quite relevant. But he expressed his concern about the future, and the latter is the result of continuous change. We do not know how Russell's colleagues

in the House of Lords reacted to his speech, but our reply to his question sounds something like this: Yes, perhaps science did harness nuclear energy "too early", at a time when it could still be used against humanity. But a scientific society can exist, about that there is no doubt. Moreover, it is to prevent self-destruction that mankind should heed the voice of progressive science and assert new relations among individuals and nations based on the principles of socialism.

All right, one might say, science is innocent, let us drop all charges against it and let us blame social conditions. But will this change the fact that the danger is now always with us, that the ability to make the nuclear bomb now hangs over us as the eternal curse, as the heavy burden of knowledge? Isn't mankind now like the hardluck character from political thrillers who has accidentally learned a horrible secret and is therefore doomed to death?

What does Schell think on this score? Strange as it may seem, he thinks that this sword of Damocles is the only means of saving mankind from itself. Knowledge as a deterrent, it seems, will be the basic principle of life in a world where the problem of the nuclear danger has been solved. The problem arose from knowledge, and in knowledge we must find the answer. This knowledge, while dooming mankind to exist forever with the thought that the risk to its life cannot be removed, would also mean "the full emotional, intellectual, spiritual and visceral understanding of the meaning of extinction — above all, the meaning of the unborn generations to the living. Because extinction is the end of mankind, it can never be anything more than 'knowledge' for us; we can never 'experience' extinction. It is *this* knowledge—this

horror at a murderous action taken against generations yet unborn... that must become the deterrent." [1]

So mankind will have to live in constant fear from which there is no escape. Moreover, it transpires that such a state even has an advantage of a sort because it compels us to realise our duty to the future generations. This example of evil doing good shows not only the ability to adapt to circumstances typical of man's everyday consciousness (roughly speaking, to put a good face on a bad job), but also reflects Christian submission to divine Providence. From a religious point of view constant suffering sent to man for his sins should be accepted not with indignation or revolt, but with patience and even joy, because it is redemption, purification from evil. Schell puts a similar construction on things.

Frankly speaking, living in eternal fear and under duress is a very bleak prospect. Like an alcoholic with a vial of medicine sewn into the abdomen—if you have a drink, you are done for, so regard every day you live as a gift from heaven.

Of course, you can get used to anything in the end. Didn't the slaves live on their knees passing on their wretched lot from father to son? Didn't entire nations live in oppression for centuries, not just for years or decades? Yet they managed to survive and even to preserve their culture.

In other words, we are being told to accept a philosophy of obedience, of adaptation to circumstances which, it is claimed, are beyond human power to overcome. Such adaptation would be justified to some extent if there was no alternative. But the whole point is that there is no alternative only

---

[1] Schell, p. 223.

when people submit and lose heart before the nuclear danger.

No, thank you very much. Mankind is not doomed to live in fear. It is capable of driving away the spectre of an atomic mushroom cloud frozen over our planet. Our world will cease to be a nuclear one when it ceases to be a world of social and national oppression, of the plunder of backward nations, of colonial and neocolonial dependence, of imperialism, terrorism and crime, of unfair trade, of financial instability, trade barriers, poverty, unemployment, lack of rights, hunger, bureaucracy, corruption, etc. Of course, the word "nuclear" will remain in the human language, but after several generations of normal life people will forget the sinister meaning linked with this word nowadays.

It is a historical goal of both socialism and communism to rule out the possibility of using scientific knowledge against man.

Death of War!

After dealing with the responsibility of science let us clarify another, no less major and interesting question—on the future of war.

In recent years the view that nuclear weapons have killed war has become widespread among theoreticians of various schools. Schell is an ardent supporter of this view and argues in favour of it in his book.

Let us say, first of all, that the idea is based on a serious argument. Imagine a general giving an order to attack knowing in advance that it will result in wiping out both the enemy and his own army. We would have every reason to regard him

as a criminal or madman. Yet this is just the situation created by the nuclear arsenals possessed by the main military and political groupings, the arsenals capable of destroying both the other side and the rest of the world together with it.

The reasoning seems irreproachable, but it nevertheless has a flaw.

How can you speak about the death of war when it remains a reality of our time? There have been several dozen wars since 1945. They were not accidental sporadic clashes, but full-scale hostilities between states with the use of practically every type of conventional weapons, and with all the attributes of war: killed, wounded, prisoners of war, truces, negotiations, annexations and indemnities. Consequently, we shall have to say as a minimum that "conventional wars" are not dead at all, if we take the nature of the weapons used as a yardstick. If we proceed from political typology, we shall see that the armed conflicts of the past few decades have reflected almost the entire spectrum of wars: imperialist wars, wars of aggression, punitive, national liberation, territorial, prestigious wars, etc.

The whole spectrum with just one type of war missing—a direct clash between nuclear powers. Schell, pointing to the nearly 40-year-old "jittery peace" between them maintained since atomic bombs came into being, alleges that "war has gone out of existence" in relations between nuclear powers. It has been struck off the list of instruments of defending their interests. The reason is that the choice is now very limited—either peace or universal annihilation, and the latter "is as far from being war as peace is". [1]

---

[1] Schell, p. 193.

But if we assume that the 40-year-old peace *itself* gives us reason to declare war removed from the political scene, there would have been even more justification for drawing such a conclusion in the last century when a stable, almost fifty-year-long peace reigned in Europe after 1870 with a very few exceptions. And yet war neither died nor became obsolete then. Nearly all the major European powers armed themselves frantically in preparation for a future bloody clash.

As a matter of fact, the entire optimistic sophistry about the "death of war" is refuted by one simple argument: if that is really so, then why should we go to the trouble of writing books on the nuclear danger?

Making the wish father to the thought, the supporters of the "death-of-war" concept also maintain unanimously that the well-known formula of Karl von Clausewitz that war is the continuation of politics by other means is outdated. This claim is also the result of a theoretical confusion. Indeed, first we have to specify whether war is no longer the continuation of politics or whether war should no longer be that. Wars are declared and waged by people, and in the final analysis everything depends on their attitude to the question of war and peace, on how they think, on how they assess the situation, and on how they make decisions. If, contrary to all warnings, both politicians and generals believe that there is a chance that they may win a nuclear battle, no assurances by theoreticians that Clausewitz's formula is outmoded can be of any use here.

In other words, if we really want to bury nuclear war before it is born, we must outlaw it, declare it both criminal and insane, and rule out any idea of winning it. Such an attitude to the nuclear

danger should not only be the conscious view of every person, it should also be elevated to a principle of international politics observed by all countries without exception.

This is exactly the stand adopted by the Soviet Union, which, as one of the two leading nuclear powers, has a special responsibility to prevent a holocaust. For years all official statements by the Soviet leadership have emphasised that nuclear war would mean destruction for mankind. This attitude found its logical expression in the USSR's unilateral commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union, compelled to create its nuclear missile arsenal to protect its own security and that of its socialist allies, has always regarded it as a weapon of deterrence and retribution. The Soviet government did all it could at each stage of the arms race not only to halt the nuclear buildup, but also to start the destruction of nuclear arsenals on a reciprocal basis until they were fully eliminated.

The US stand, however, blocks progress on this issue. If the reactionary circles of American imperialism recognise that there will be no winners in a nuclear war, they will lose the opportunity to use nuclear arms as a means of political blackmail. This is precisely what US leaders, from President Truman to President Reagan, have seen as the chief value of such weapons.

Of course, there are people in the American ruling circles who have common sense and realise the absolute inadmissibility of nuclear war. Western political scientists keep counting the doves and the hawks to see who is in the majority. But even if the doves are more numerous, this does not mean anything at all—yet. The whole section of society involved in political decision-making,

not a mere arithmetical majority, must fully realise the fatality of a nuclear holocaust. There is one sure sign that the balance is not yet in favour of the realists—the United States keeps stubbornly refusing to follow the Soviet Union and make a commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

That is why it is a matter of no small importance when Schell appeals to his fellow-countrymen to understand that no one is going to survive in a nuclear war. The more deeply this idea sinks into the minds of the ordinary Americans, the more chance there will be that this will finally materialise in US official policy.

However, to prevent a nuclear catastrophe it is not enough to say that it will result in the death of mankind. Of no less principal importance is the recognition that a nuclear war, once started, will inevitably become an all-out conflict.

American strategists, compelled to reckon with scientific estimates and growing public concern, are trying to find a loophole in the argument about the death of civilisation in the event of nuclear war. Suppose it is true, some of them maintain, that there will be no winners in an all-out nuclear conflict and that all people without exception will be killed. But why should the use of nuclear weapons result in an all-out conflict? Why cannot we envisage the use of tactical nuclear weapons in conventional military operations? Or why cannot there be an exchange of nuclear strikes without their growth into a universal holocaust?

That is roughly how the supporters of the so-called limited nuclear war reason. The first ideas of this kind came into fashion as far back as the late 1950s. In those days the American ruling cir-

cles were looking for an alternative to the strategy of massive retaliation fathered by the then Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. Compared with the blunt statements of such politicians as Rolf T. Busch that an all-out nuclear conflict is winnable, their arguments appear almost dovish. In fact, however, it is an even more dangerous hawkish line, because it is more cunning and treacherous and more difficult to refute.

Indeed, what is meant here is a situation unknown to mankind from previous experience and impossible to predict precisely. When it comes to the probable results of an all-out nuclear conflict, mathematics has a weighty say on the subject. Specialists assessing the results of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki blasts and counting up the destructive power of the stockpiled nuclear weapons can predict with certainty the consequences of a more or less simultaneous use of all nuclear weapons. Where "limited nuclear war" is concerned, however, we already enter the sphere of guessing games. Indeed, why shouldn't one suppose that one side delivers a single pre-emptive nuclear strike and that the attacked side will limit itself to a single retaliatory strike and that the matter will end there?

To lend more weight to their argument, the theoreticians of "limited nuclear war" give concrete examples. Suppose, they say, the Soviet Union captures West Berlin... Suppose the USSR invades the Middle East to bring its oil-fields under its control... Let us assume that Moscow has moved its tanks to extend Soviet power to Western Europe. In each of these cases there would be no need for the US to shower all of its nuclear missiles on the USSR. It would be enough to launch a Pershing-2 to knock out a military air-

field near Moscow to frighten the "aggressor" and make him retreat. The main objective would thus be achieved, the interests of the United States and its allies would be protected. What is more, they would not have to suffer for it, because the Soviet leadership would obviously not order a retaliatory nuclear strike knowing that it would entail crushing retribution.

As we can see, this argument has a dual purpose. On the one hand, it is used to assure the West Europeans that limited or "selective" use of nuclear arms threatens them in no way. On the other, the idea is to brainwash them into believing that the threat of attack comes from the socialist countries. It does not even occur to Schell, a true-blue American patriot, to question such fabrications. He also assumes that the Soviet Union would be the attacker while the United States would be on the defensive, fighting for the "frontiers of freedom". Here we can only regret that the author has lacked the courage and objectivity to go beyond the stereotypes of official American propaganda.

However, unlike many of his fellow-journalists, he convincingly shows the untenability of the concept of "limited nuclear war", no matter which side might start it. Giving several scenarios of a nuclear exchange, Schell notes that strategic theory acquires an incomprehensible, fantastic life of its own in them, and that nuclear weapons would settle their own scores regardless of the objectives pursued by people. "In general, in the theoretically sophisticated but often humanly deficient world of nuclear strategic theory it is likely to be overlooked that the outbreak of nuclear hostilities in itself assumes the collapse of every usual restraint of reason and humanity. Once the

mass killing of a nuclear holocaust had begun, the scruples, and even the reckonings of self-interest, that normally keep the actions of nations within certain bounds would by definition have been trampled down, and would probably offer little further protection for anybody. In the unimaginable mental and spiritual climate of the world at that point it is hard to imagine what force could be counted on to hold the world back from all-out destruction." [1]

Of course, Schell continues, no one can guarantee that if one nuclear missile were launched, it would inevitably be followed by all the rest. Anything may happen. But one thing is certain: as soon as the first nuclear charge is exploded, the world will enter "a vast unknown". Lurking there is a high, if not a one-hundred per cent, probability that a "limited nuclear exchange" would serve as just the fuse to trigger off an all-out war.

As a matter of fact, while in the past, differences between the two versions of American strategy did give rise to discussions between the hawks and the semi-hawks, such discussions became absolutely pointless after Ronald Reagan's arrival in the White House. As the West German magazine *Der Spiegel* once observed, under the Reagan Administration the champions of war have got the upper hand over those who wanted to avoid it. Weinberger's Pentagon has whipped up the arms race to try and ensure that America can not only contain a war of any kind, but also unleash and win it. This applies to a conventional war, a limited nuclear war, a limited or a six-month protracted war and an all-out war. The author also quotes an original text from the Pen-

[1] Schell, p. 32.

tagon's "Fiscal Year 1984-1988 Defence Guidance" concerning the arms programme endorsed by President Reagan in the summer of 1983. It states in black and white that if a strategic nuclear war against the Soviet Union breaks out, the United States must win it and force the USSR to end hostilities as soon as possible on conditions favourable to the US.[1] An American arms control expert, Arthur Macy Cox, has described the directives on the "satisfactory" and "favourable" outcome of a nuclear war as fantasies based on sheer madness. It is almost incredible, he observes, that such a way of thinking could have become a basis for internal debate and planning in Washington. Nevertheless, this is just the case.

Mutual Deterrence

War is not dead; it is just biding its time, pretending to be dead.

What about those who are trying to calm the world public by talking about the instinct of self-preservation? There is nothing to worry about, they say, since it has been possible to avoid a catastrophe for years, although the stocks of nu-

[1] This is how a State Department consultant, Colin S. Gray, has formulated the essence of this doctrine: "The United States should plan to defeat the Soviet Union and to do so at a cost that would not prohibit US recovery. Washington should identify war aims that in the last resort would contemplate the destruction of Soviet political authority and the emergence of a postwar world order compatible with Western values... A combination of counterforce offensive targeting, civil defence, and ballistic missile and air defence should hold US casualties to approximately 20 million, which should render US strategic threats more credible" ("The Progressive", Madison, June 1983, p. 22).

clear weapons have been piling up all the time and the nuclear club has kept expanding. Of course, there have been some dramatic moments (as, for instance, the 1953 West Berlin crisis or the 1962 Caribbean crisis), but no fatal step was taken thanks to the restraint and common sense displayed by both sides. Moreover, the crises served as a test for the existing tacit agreement not to start a nuclear war. So why should we suppose that this is not going to continue in the future?

This optimism stems from the assumption that in present conditions *mutual deterrence* serves as the most reliable basis for the prevention of nuclear war. However, a closer look at the world situation shows beyond doubt that even if this doctrine and the corresponding policy did help to preserve peace over the past few decades, it cannot rest on such a shaky foundation for long.

Firstly, even if both sides scrupulously observe the rules and the code of conduct which have emerged around the concept of mutual deterrence (both legal, recorded in various treaties, and moral, gentleman's agreements), the danger will keep increasing in view of the buildup and, in particular, qualitative improvement of weapons of mass destruction. The more weapons stuffed with electronic devices are made, the greater the chance that some time, somewhere automatic devices may break down and a war may start by accident.[1] The nuclear club[2] keeps expanding, which un-

[1] According to UNESCO, there have been at least 125 such accidents over the past 30 years, most of them involving the US (96).

[2] Estimates by American experts indicate that 11 countries may go nuclear by the end of this century: Pakistan, Iraq, Taiwan, Lebanon, South Korea, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Israel, South Africa, Brazil and Argentina.

doubtedly adds to the uncertainty. The number of the potential sources of a worldwide conflict is not the only thing that is increasing. The range of the problem situations that may serve as a pretext for it is also expanding.

In other words, simply sticking to the stand of mutual deterrence without seeking to lower the level of military confrontation means putting up with increasing nuclear danger.

Secondly, the concept of mutual deterrence is being undermined by trigger-happy hawks in the American ruling class. The latter have never reconciled themselves to the rough military parity between the Soviet Union and the United States, gripped by a nostalgia for those days when the latter enjoyed a tangible military superiority. For instance, while in the 1970s the Pentagon and the upper crust of the military-industrial complex were compelled to restrain their appetites, under Reagan they now have a free hand. And, needless to say, the threat to upset the military balance, in particular, by deploying hundreds of additional US medium-range missiles in Western Europe, starting the production of MX missiles and neutron bombs, boosting military spending, etc., undermines the basis of mutual deterrence.

Finally, the concept itself is self-contradictory and allows for different interpretations to suit various selfish interests.

Schell begins from the end in his reasoning here. Suppose, he says, one side delivers the first strike with all the forces at its disposal. What will be the situation of the leaders on the other side? Their territory is already a radioactive desert, but the systems of nuclear retaliation have survived in silos, on bombers and in submarines. What will be the aim of the retaliatory strike for

them? It cannot be national security because there is no nation any more. Nor can it be the defence of other nations because retaliation will finally destroy the ecosphere and put an end to the existence of mankind. It is impossible to predict what their decision will be under such circumstances.

Uncertainty about the victim's reaction undermines the idea of deterrence because there emerges a chance (even though it is pretty slim and risky) to deliver a strike without retribution. So theoreticians are beginning to rack their brains over ruling out such a situation. One version is that each side must be absolutely certain that the enemy will not hesitate to retaliate. Another version suggested by American theoreticians is to create the impression that your actions are uncontrollable or make them such. Lack of control is just like insanity. You don't need any reasonable motive for anything, including a retaliatory strike. It comes as if accidentally. Schell notes in this connection that H. R. Haldeman, President Nixon's chief of staff, observes in his memoirs that the latter believed in the "Madman Theory" of the Presidency. Under this theory, enemies would bow to the President's will when they saw that he was insane and prepared to run the risk of a nuclear holocaust to attain limited national objectives.

Schell also describes the idea suggested by the American futurologist Hermann Kahn to put right the flaws of the mutual deterrence doctrine. The latter has proposed making a "doomsday machine" to explode the world as soon as the enemy takes action unacceptable from the owner's point of view. The author puts the cost of the machine at 10,000 million dollars. Naturally enough, the machine is not going to have any doubts about a retaliatory strike. In this case people would be de-

nied the possibility of decision-making, entrusting their fate to an automaton.

What if the "doomsday machine" makes its fatal decision without any foundation, due to a computer error? Hermann Kahn and other American nuclear strategy theoreticians, playing with the intricate scenarios of a "retaliatory strike", become carried away with this game as if it were a chess problem. Their inflamed imaginations easily commit to the atomic blaze Leningrad and Chicago, wipe half of Europe off the map, and arrange all-out battles in the ocean and outer space. They are trying to convince the public in all earnest (and perhaps they believe it themselves) that such games are aimed at developing an irreproachable logical scheme for "mutual deterrence" and, consequently, at strengthening peace.

Francisco Goya used to say that the sleep of reason breeds monsters. We can also say in reverse that the birth of monsters points to the sleep of reason. Instead of drawing up schemes for a second strike, Kahn and his colleagues would be well advised to give some thought to how the first strike could be avoided and why, unlike the Soviet Union, the United States keeps refusing to make appropriate commitments.

As for their present theorising, I shall limit myself to agreeing with Schell's assessment that the untenability of the nuclear deterrence doctrine arises from a basic error—the emphasis on a strike entailing universal destruction in order to prevent such destruction.

It would be opportune here to make a slight digression.

Schell is not always very logical. He supplies proof for some of his ideas while others the reader must accept on trust. Some ideas are both pro-

found and original, but on the next page you find banal and naive statements. Perhaps the most characteristic feature of Schell as well as of many other US intellectuals for that matter, is an intricate mixture of views common to all people and class-oriented views, global and purely American ideas. In some places there is a common denominator, as there must be when one is discussing the nuclear threat, but in other cases his ideas clash with each other, and the American philistine in him gets the upper hand over the "citizen of the world". In other words, Schell gives plenty of cause for argument, which is only natural when dealing with an author whose ideological positions are different from your own.

However, one very important circumstance should be borne in mind in this context. The struggle of ideas can and must be uncompromising when it comes to the principles of social structure, when people discuss what is better—private or public ownership, and what system guarantees human rights more reliably, etc. Participants in such ideological disputes are not obliged to seek agreement, which would be pointless anyway, since it is impossible to reconcile world views directly opposite in their essence. It is up to the peoples and history to decide which of them meets the needs of mankind better, which of them has a future.

On Sovereignty and World Government

What political conditions can ensure the most favourable development for mankind? Here we face another key problem of our time—the *correlation between the national and the international.* On this issue Schell sticks to a trend in Western

political thought which sees the source of all troubles in national sovereignty and regards world government as the solution.

The nuclear powers, Schell argues, maintain and build up their armed forces not to guarantee peace but to ensure their national interests and aspirations, in the final analysis, to perpetuate the system of sovereign states. National security serves as the official motive for military spending, and this concept covers a multitude of sins. For instance, the United States declared the Persian Gulf an area of its national security interests and President Carter, in his day, stated that any attempt by outside forces to establish control over that area would be regarded as an encroachment on US vital interests. Such an encroachment would be repulsed by every possible means, including military force. Consequently, Schell concludes, the United States is prepared to use nuclear arms on the pretext of defending national security, while in fact the problem is American desire for Middle East oil. We could add to this that Washington has declared Latin America, the Middle East, Western Europe, Oceania, Japan, South-East Asia, etc. zones of US national interests.

By drawing a parallel between individual society and the system of international relations, Schell observes that some time in the past, in the transition from a natural state to a civic one, individuals ceded their right to violence to a central power which, in accordance with certain rules, utilises the sum total of common resources for the common good. Unfortunately, there was no such "social contract" on a world scale. Since there is no central government here, decision-making remains decentralised and in fact each member of this community, each state can veto the further

existence of the human race. That is why Schell considers the system of world government the summit of statesmanship.

I don't know about American theoreticians, but we certainly do not consider this system the summit of statesmanship. It needs radical improvement but no matter how indignant you are or how long you wave your hands in the air, things are not going to change because of that. The system of sovereign national states is an objective result of the action of the laws of social development which predetermined the emergence of nations and organisations regulating the life of society within the framework of national-territorial communities. This, of course, is not the summit of development; it is just one of its stages. The present-day system is bound to give way to a more perfect world order, but this will become possible only when socialism triumphs around the world.

Schell, however, like other bourgeois theoreticians, wants a world government without socialism. But can there be a world government without socialism? Let us make a mental experiment here too. Suppose all countries regardless of their social systems agree to place their future in the hands of a world government to remove the danger of universal annihilation and a nuclear holocaust and to solve other vital problems facing mankind. Once it gets down to business, the world government will have to engage in planning, stock-taking, distribution and redistribution of resources to do away with hunger, disease, poverty, and the gap between the developing and developed countries[1] within a fairly short space of time. How

[1] Incidentally, these were the first steps taken by a world government formed after a nuclear holocaust in the novel *The World Set Free* by H. G. Wells.

would the US react to that? It is not hard to guess its reaction.

It is common knowledge that the United States is dominated by big business which finds firm support in what is known as the middle class. This is a fairly considerable part of the population which can share in the consumption of American wealth to varying degrees. We are not going at this junction to touch upon the question of how that wealth is made, what plays the greater part in it—value created by labour or superprofits from arms sales, technological genius or dividents pumped by corporations from developing countries, the American business acumen or gratuitous advantages stemming from the Bretton Woods system (that is, a system whereby the dollar is the cornerstone of the monetary system in the entire capitalist world and is raised to the level of gold). Be it as it may, not only the Wall Street bosses, but also millions of other well-to-do Americans are in a privileged position compared with thousands of millions of people in other parts of the world. Suffice it to say that per capita energy consumption in the US is 50 times greater than that of the average person elsewhere in the world. So will those who enjoy such privileges under the US system of private enterprise agree to a fairer distribution of world wealth?

Can it be that American bourgeois theoreticians never ask themselves such questions when they appeal for the setting up of a world government? It would be very naive to think so. The whole point is that they attack sovereignty because they see it not so much as an obstacle to disarmament as a barrier to the spread of American influence. The way they see it, America can afford to risk losing sovereignty because it has overwhelming

economic, scientific and technological superiority. This superiority, in their view, is supposed to secure a predominant position for American business interests, corporations, science, technology, for the US political system, pop culture and tastes. In other words, a world government and the abolition of sovereignty are again understood as the American leadership of society which almost all the politicians and ideologists in the US keep talking about.

American imperialist ideology represents the summit of bourgeois egoism. It does not depart at all from the iron rules of business, it is devoid of any Christian mercy, which sometimes makes itself felt in the ideology of the "Old World". This manifests itself most graphically in the fact that while they claim leadership, American ideologists (the vast majority of them, anyway) do not believe that in exchange the US should assume some responsibility for the plight of the under-developed countries and make some sacrifices for their sake. Nothing of the kind. We have a God-given right to leadership—that is their motto.

President Truman, in a statement broadcast to his fellow countrymen on August 9, 1945, thanked God for making it possible for the Americans to develop the atomic bomb before anybody else and asked the Almighty for guidance as to its use. This was nothing but outright blasphemy—to embark on the road of nuclear blackmail using God's will as a cover. Forty years later hypocrites from the White House, taking God's name in vain every minute, are holding forth about America's unique worthiness to be world leader. They are pushing through a programme of blatant interference in the affairs of other states to promote American interests and impose American ways and customs

on others. This is a very real attack on sovereignty. The only difference is that, contrary to the schemes proposed by Schell, this can result only in an increased danger of war. [1]

It is curious that for decades capitalist propaganda has been accusing the Soviet Union of intending to force the Soviet model upon everybody and of using socialist ideas to promote "Russian imperialism". Yet what we see in practice is a multiplicity of economic and political forms in the countries of real socialism, a wide variety of development methods in the group of developing countries following the socialist road, a wide spectrum of theories of the future in the working class parties fighting for socialism in the capitalist countries. On the other hand, it is the United States with its imperial ideology that is trying to tailor the whole world to its own standards and impose its will on all.

The US Congress and President are already behaving as if they were a world government. They express their displeasure with the trade union law introduced in Poland, they curse the Salvadoran guerrillas, they recommend the West German voters to cast their ballots for the Christian Democrats and demand that the Romanian government should make it easier for people to leave the country.

It is quite likely that Schell personally did not have in mind a world government of this type.

[1] This is what Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All Russia said in his open letter to President Reagan: "Can the mad race of mass annihilation weapons be justified by the Word of God? Can one really be faithful to the commandment *Thou shalt not kill* and at the same time speak about the possibility of a 'limited nuclear war', about 'total nuclear war', 'first nuclear strike', 'victory in a nuclear war', and other criminal and sinful designs?"

But that is the way it is: even a good slogan put forward at the wrong time becomes reactionary as well as utopian.

The nuclear danger is a danger of today and it is pointless to guess at how it might have been averted in other political conditions. What is vital is to search for realistic ways of solving this problem now.

With Love and Fear

Regarding sovereignty as the main source of the nuclear danger and declaring a holy war on it, Schell is very sarcastic about the "realists" who advise us to acknowledge sovereignty as something unavoidable, calling any other alternative both unrealistic and utopian. He observes that in their "timid, crippled thinking, 'realism' is the title given to beliefs whose most notable characteristic is their failure to recognise the chief reality of the age, the pit into which our species threatens to jump; 'utopian' is the term of scorn for any plan that shows serious promise of enabling the species to keep from killing itself...; and the political arrangements that keep us on the edge of annihilation are deemed 'moderate', and are found to be 'respectable', whereas new arrangements, which might enable us to draw a few steps back from the brink, are called 'extreme', or 'radical'. With such fear-filled, thought-stopping epithets as these, the upholders of the status quo defend the anachronistic structure of their thinking, and seek to block the revolution in thought and in action which is necessary if mankind is to go on living." [1]

[1] Schell, pp. 161-162.

We find ourselves in a delicate situation here. On the one hand, we cannot but sympathise with Schell for in fact his impassioned writings are also aimed against those in the American Establishment who stubbornly cling to the dogmas of imperial policy, refusing to realise that they are playing with fire in the full sense of the word.

On the other hand, however, no matter how offended Schell might feel that his ideas are regarded as utopian, this is exactly what they are and there is no getting away from it. His vision is already seriously distorted when he accuses the upholders of the very idea of sovereignty of all mortal sins. Yet this idea plays an extremely progressive role for the developing nations, compelled in a bitter struggle to uphold the right to be masters of their own destinies and defend their independence against American imperialism.

As for the "realists", as Schell describes all defenders of sovereignty, he ought to leave alone those who quite rightly believe that at the present stage the idea of a world government is unrealisable and concentrate on seeking practical ways of settling conflicts and reducing the threat of war. He would be well advised to direct his criticism against those theoreticians and political figures who are trying to impose Pax Americana on the world on the pretext of defending sovereignty and national security.

It is perhaps in the positive programme formulated by the American writer that the vague, uncertain and weak nature of bourgeois pacifism fully reveals itself. In his view, to rid ourselves of the nuclear danger, it is necessary to transform human relations, adjusting them to life in "the nuclear common world".

The first principle of this world should be "res-

pect for human beings, born and unborn, based on our common love of life and our common jeopardy in the face of our own destructive powers and inclinations."

The second principle should be "respect for the earth", a realisation of the ecological law whereby the environment is not merely "a surrounding element in which it is more or less pleasant to live" but the foundation of human life.

And, finally, the third principle is "respect for God or nature, or whatever one chooses to call the universal dust that made, or became, us. We need to remember that neither as individuals nor as a species have we created ourselves. And we need to remember that our swollen power is not a power to create but only a power to destroy." [1]

The programme is thus intended for everyone. There is a place in it for believers and atheists (for pantheists, anyway); it is economical, abstract, and, alas, completely devoid of imagination. Indeed, let us take a closer look at the prospect Schell presents as the ideal. It is universal love fed primarily by universal fear. It is as if a team of travellers found themselves not far from the crater of a volcano on the eve of an eruption and a preacher said to them: "Brethren, let us love one another for we are threatened with certain death."

As a matter of fact, it is worthwhile quoting Schell himself. In his discourse on which law has a greater chance of asserting itself in the nuclear world, the law of love or the law of fear, he comes to the conclusion that in the final analysis one follows from the other. Why? Because the law of fear stems from love for oneself. "Love, a spiritual energy that the human heart can pit against

[1] Schell, pp. 177, 178.

the physical energy released from the heart of matter, can create, cherish, and safeguard what extinction would destroy and shut up in nothingness. But in fact there is no need, at least on the practical level, to choose between the law of fear and the law of love, because ultimately they lead to the same destination." [1] After that there is no doubt that his model of the "nuclear common world" saved from catastrophe is based on nothing else but the classic religious dogma according to which man should live in constant fear of God for his sins and that this is his only chance of salvation.

Schell should have refrained from putting forward his positive programme if his imagination went no further than reproducing the evangelical story.

How, then, does he visualise the method of "crossing" to the other side of the nuclear danger, to his ideal world of universal love based on universal fear? Strange as it may seem, he doesn't, and he says so bluntly:

"In this book, I have not sought to define a political solution to the nuclear predicament—either to embark on the full-scale re-examination of the foundations of political thought which must be undertaken if the world's political institutions are to be made consonant with the global reality in which they operate or to work out the practical steps by which mankind, acting for the first time in history as a single entity, can reorganise its political life. I have left to others those awesome, urgent tasks, which, imposed on us by history, constitute the political work of our age." [2]

---

[1] Schell, p. 225.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 219.

We must not complain, because the author is quite honest about the range of his possibilities. Despite all its flaws and weaknesses, the book will probably play a positive role by calling the attention of ordinary Americans once again to the nuclear danger, reminding them of their responsibility for the fate of the earth.

Since Schell leaves to others the real political problems of countering the nuclear danger, let us avail ourselves of this opportunity and say that the urgent, top-priority task today is to stop the nuclear arms race and take the first steps towards real disarmament. A concrete programme of action in this direction is set out in the Prague Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty member states and in the series of important Soviet initiatives on nuclear disarmament, including those put forward recently. Experience shows that, given the will, mutually acceptable solutions can be found on such complex issues. After all the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests has been concluded and the USSR and the US have signed the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty.

One would like to hope very much indeed that reason, concern for the preservation of the human race, and the instinct of self-preservation will get the upper hand over obscurantism, self-conceit and egoism. The growing nuclear freeze movement in the US is a sign that more and more Americans are coming to realise the extent of the imminent danger to the world. Schell's book is one of the many cases in point.

Since 1947 the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* in the US has carried a picture of a clock showing the approach of "doomsday" in each issue. The editors put the hands of the clock at various dis-

tances from midnight depending on how they think the winds of world politics are blowing.

It is clear to everybody that of late the hands of that clock have come ominously close to midnight. But one can say already now with certainty that the reaction to this warning is not apathy or fear, but the resolve to avert the danger. As an organism fights a disease, so mankind is now mobilising all its powerful defences to prevent nuclear midnight from ever coming.

THIS BRAVE NEW WORLD IN THAT NOTORIOUS NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR

We thought about the problem of war and peace together with Jonathan Schell, and now the problem of the social structure takes us to the novels of the English writers Aldous Huxley and George Orwell *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

Schell is our contemporary. Huxley and Orwell belong to bygone generations. Why such a choice, why have I chosen to take books which saw the light of day more than 50 and about 40 years ago respectively to examine questions that are among the most burning issues of today? Both novels remain in the focus of the continuing worldwide ideological polemics. They epitomise the concepts of Western liberal political thought concerning the future, its strong and weak points, hopes and disappointments, sober guesses and serious errors.

There is more to it even than that. Huxley's and Orwell's novels belong to the category of "warning novels" or, to put it simply, anti-utopias. By examining them it is possible to trace to what extent the authors' predictions have come true and to assess more deeply the meaning and trends of the changes taking place in the world. This particularly applies to George Orwell's book: mankind has now

entered the year 1984 which he chose at random to describe the future. Much has been published on this score in scientific journals and political magazines and the argument as to how correct or wrong the British writer was has flared up with renewed force. *Time* magazine even called 1984 "the Orwellian year".[1]

Speaking in the most general terms, Huxley's and Orwell's anti-utopias carry over to the future both the negative tendencies linked with technological progress and the bourgeois fear of collectivism. However, the paradox lies in the fact that they have described *not quite the type of society or quite a different type of society from the one they had in mind.* The reasons for such a paradox will become clear if we examine the quintessence of *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and compare it with reality.

Of course, this cannot be done without a degree of simplification because we are dealing not with scientific treatises but with works of fiction where ideas are embodied in images and the author's message is conveyed to the reader not only through the direct speech of the protagonists but by the whole atmosphere of the narrative.

We cannot disregard the differences between the two novels either. Although their authors come from the same milieu (the well-to-do British intelligentsia whose views are shaped in Eton, Oxford and Cambridge), they differ from each other very considerably. Huxley represents a liberal democratic trend while Orwell's views place him among the supporters of right-wing socialism. Huxley is chiefly a philosopher with a predomi-

[1] *Time*, November 28, 1983, p. 31.

nantly literary touch, Orwell is a politician and a publicist.

It must also be borne in mind that *Brave New World* was written in 1932, before Hitler came to power; *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was published in 1949, after World War II when mankind already knew what fascism was. Needless to say, this circumstance predetermined the different colouring of the future: it is radiant and glowing in Huxley's work while in Orwell's book it is morbidly black.

The whole point, however, is that the rosy picture of *Brave New World* is nothing but the lining of the same black suit put by Orwell on the society of 1984. Despite the different conceptions and even a large distance in time between the events described in the two books (Huxley refers his anti-utopia to the year 2500 approximately), there are coincidences in some key points which makes it possible to bring the two novels under a common denominator.

Controlled Life

The first component of it is *total organisation.* Science, literature, art, everyday life, family, to say nothing of the production and distribution of material and cultural values—practically every aspect of human life and activity is included in a single mechanism operating according to an order established once and for all and directed by some supreme will. There is practically no boundary between the private and the social; since the ubiquitous state runs the entertainments industry, it also controls at will the leisure time of its citizens or, to be more exact, subjects.

The main feature of any superorganisation is

that it becomes an end in itself. This is precisely the case in the "brave new world" and the society of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Although the officially declared objective of the state is general welfare and happiness, in fact all its activity is devoted to the task of self-preservation. This is expressed very graphically in the fact that even the ruling set (ten "World Controllers" in Huxley's book and the mysterious "Big Brother" and his closest associates in Orwell's) are compelled to subordinate their will and passions to the mystical "common interest" which in some incomprehensible manner does not meet anybody's real interests. Unlike the usual rulers, whether charismatic leaders or simply dictators, those people do not formulate the aims of their government. Nor do they derive any particular advantages from their position.

Although supreme power seems to be uncontrolled, it is in fact a kind of automatic control unit in a machine and just one of the machine's parts in the long run. Everyone, from those at the foot of the social pyramid to its rulers are slaves to that state machine. Significantly, individual members of the ruling elite like Mustapha Mond in *Brave New World* and O'Brien in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* view everything fairly soberly and realise the crying injustice of the established ways, but it does not even occur to them to do something to change them. How can cogwheels encroach on the mechanism? Dictators in Huxley's and Orwell's anti-utopias are also cogwheels, only larger ones.

The subordination of organisation to the task of preserving the status quo is typical of other features of the social structure too. Anti-utopian societies are divided into classes or castes. The division is extremely rigid, and any social mobility

is practically ruled out.[1] In *Brave New World* society has five castes (Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, Epsilon) while in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* it consists of the two main classes—the governors and the governed.

This social structure resembles the feudal or capitalist system on the one hand while it also differs from it in one very important respect. The point is that its upper crust does not exist in order to enjoy life by exploiting the labour of the mass of the working people. Although the elite does have some privileges (as, for instance, the daily ration of stinking gin which the "proles" in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* cannot even dream of), in the final analysis they live in the same circumstances.

In other words, a high place in the social hierarchy has almost no consequences; the white- and blue-collar workers differ from one another only by the nature of their functions, by the places they occupy on the state assembly line. Both are doomed to be passive human automatons equally alienated from their human essence. The functional meaning of social stratification is also emphasised by the fact that people are divided into castes not by virtue of origin or inheritance, but by chance.

Finally, this totalitarian organisation results in the complete standardisation of people within the framework of each social stratum. All of them,

---

[1] Huxley guarantees this division physiologically. In *Brave New World* the human race "multiplies" artificially on an industrial basis, and all the newborn "specimens" are in advance divided into castes and given specific qualities through the use of chemicals, hypnopedia and a refined system of conditioning.

with a very few exceptions, lose their individual features and resemble one another like peas in a pod. Naturally, nothing can be better for the optimisation of the production process organised as an assembly line. It does not occur to anybody to count the losses resulting from the absolute suppression of creative endeavour and the artificial "averaging" of man.

What for? The aim of the system is not to make improvements and reach higher stages of progress. No, its purpose is the cyclic reproduction of conditions for its existence. Those few who, as a result of some divine illumination, suddenly realise the true meaning of life and the destiny of man, are compelled to hide their unorthodoxy on pain of death.

The next feature of Huxley's and Orwell's anti-utopian societies is a logical result or even component of totalitarian organisation. It is *total control*. The life of the people, no matter what social stratum fate has consigned them to, is regimented down to the minutest detail. Their every step is planned and any deviation from this order similar to the endless run of the hands of the clock is vigorously checked.

Control extends to every sphere of life and consciousness that can be controlled and even to those which might at first seem to be beyond control. First of all, this is work done under the watchful eye of overseers who are also controlled by others who, in turn, are monitored by others, etc. In other words, there is no loophole for shirking orders.

Everyday life is also under full control. In Orwell's world not only do you watch the telescreen, it also watches your every step. The telescreen also orchestrates Two Minutes Love for "Big

Brother" and Two Minutes Hate for his main enemy (God—devil); if someone fails to display due zeal during the session, it will not go unnoticed by the watchful eye behind the telescreen.

Sex is also controlled, although the methods differ according to the functional role of the social groups. The governing class is supposed to preserve its ideological "purity" and intolerance to any dissent, and since the sexual drive immerses a person in a vortex of base passions, weakens the will and may divert him or her from lofty thoughts, it is viewed as extremely undesirable in that social environment. Accordingly, marriage is seen as an inevitable evil, extramarital relations even between single men and women are regarded as a grave anti-social offence while the sexual energy of youth is channelled into organised activity through mass recruitment into the Anti-Sex League.

The attitude towards sex is quite different among the "proles". In that environment it is viewed not only as a necessary condition for the reproduction of the work force and replenishment of the continuously fighting army, but also, which is of no less importance, as a very effective means of filling the brief hours of leisure, the suppression of any undesirable thoughts. That is why everything is done to encourage sexual freedom and a special section at the Ministry of Truth (Pornosec) is even engaged in putting out cheap pornographic brochures.

As for society in *Brave New World*, it has achieved even more impressive "successes" in controlling sexual and family life. This society simply does not know such concepts as love, family, father, mother, brother or sister. They have withered away together with natural childbirth and the

switch to the mass biological production of millions of stereotyped "Gammas" and "Deltas".

However, it is the mind that is subject to particularly thorough control. In the society of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, agents of the special Thought Police scurry about everywhere. No sooner does someone divert himself for a second from pious reflections on the grandeur and righteousness of the existing social order or betray a seditious idea that somehow occurred to him by a careless word or gesture, than the game is up with him.

The "brave new world" solves this problem in its own original way. Indeed, why bring things to crime and punishment, why burden the state budget with the upkeep of a special police force if chemistry can take preventive measures and protect the brain in advance against sedition? So in special labs where they grow test tube embryos of the lower castes scientists add alcohol to the flasks. As a result, the brain of those babies shrinks to a size sufficient to carry out menial jobs but excluding idle philosophising.

History control serves as an important supplement to thought control in both anti-utopias. Of course, what would happen if some specimen, in a sudden outburst of curiosity, comes across a truthful description of the past, and the revolutionary idea that life may be different begins to spread like an infection. To avoid this danger, history has practically been ousted from the extremely poor set of standardised cultural values and its miserable remnants are distorted in every possible (and impossible) way to suit the considerations of the moment.

Immediately after the "brave new world" came into being, everything that might remind people of their past was methodically destroyed. The

museums were closed, the monuments were blown up, the reading of books and their printing were banned. A maxim once uttered by the automobile king Henry Ford "History is nonsense" [1] became the motto. The philosophy of Orwellian society is summed up in the slogan "Who controls the past, controls the future; who controls the present, controls the past."

Reason Turned Upside Down

The question arises how, by what means the nightmarish worlds (in the full sense of the word) described by Huxley and Orwell can exist. The answer is by *total deception.* Literally everything is turned upside down in the Orwellian society of *Nineteen Eighty-Four.* The Ministry of Peace wages continuous wars, the Ministry of Plenty distributes meagre food rations, the Ministry of Truth spreads all sorts of lies and misinformation while the Ministry of Love combines the functions of the FBI and the CIA. Likewise the widely advertised slogans of the predominant ideology sound absurd: "war is peace", "freedom is slavery" and "ignorance is strength".

It transpires, however, that this absurdity, this juggling with words is done for a very important reason. It is far from a mere exercise in sophism, as one might think at first glance. The rulers, by deliberately upsetting traditional concepts and turning the formulas of common sense upside

[1] Curiously enough, *Brave New World* introduced a new system of chronology starting from the birth of H. Ford–a more than transparent hint at the origin of that world in the heartless assembly line and the sweat-shop system of capitalism in its later phase.

down, deprive the mass of the people of any ethical criteria and condition them into accepting at face value any absurdity they might want to sell them. No one in the world of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* dares to question any statement of the authorities even if they maintain that two and two is five.

As a matter of fact, that world is not content with mere deception, it uses a whole series of coercive measures and encouragement to make it *self-deception*. So although "Big Brother" died long ago, everybody sincerely believes that the leader lives on. The same applies to his antipode. The three remaining superpowers are so engrossed in their own affairs that they hardly come into contact with one another, yet the people of each of them are convinced that they are in a state of an endless war and to prevent this self-deception from being dispelled the government drops "foreign" bombs on its own cities from time to time.

While in Orwell's world self-deception still has to be backed up by deception from time to time, in Huxley's anti-utopia the need for it has long ago ceased to exist. As has been said, in that society the human race is reproduced on an industrial basis, which makes it possible to turn out "batches" of uniform people with pre-set features. Besides, "desirable truths" are suggested with the aid of hypnopedia. While members of the lower castes are asleep they are conditioned, by the endless repetition of one and the same idea, into believing that their social status is enviable; the rulers' view is that the secret of happiness lies in making people love their social functions in life.

Total organisation, total control and total deception and self-deception are thus the pillars on

which the societies of both *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and *Brave New World* rest. Here, however, the similarity between the two novels ends to give way to substantial differences. They differ first of all on the most important point—the question of origin.

Incidentally, Huxley never raises it at all. Since his entire "new world" is nothing but a set of some features of the contemporary capitalist society that he knew hyperbolised a thousandfold, its genesis is apparent. The author addresses the reader as if he is setting out a mathematical problem: let us assume that the deformities of society we now observe will continue to develop unhindered—what will society look like in 600 years? Although his answer is of necessity hypothetical, it is based on real trends in life.

It is not a scientific forecast because Huxley consciously (or subconsciously) ignores all the factors that might prevent the emergence of the "brave new world". But it is not a fantasy either. It is "warning" science fiction or an anti-utopia in the classical sense of the word.

On the contrary, Orwell, through the main protagonist of his book, asks who needed to create the nightmarish society of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and why? The answer sounds like this. From time immemorial mankind was divided into three strata: the upper, the middle, and the lower. The first always sought to keep its domination, the second strove to change places with it, while the third was too crushed by drudgery to hope for any changes. However, in the mid-20th century there appeared an elite which had discovered a way of perpetuating its power by artificially keeping living standards down because a growth in them stimulates political activity and by establishing that

absolute totalitarian dictatorship we have been talking about.

In other words, Orwellian society owes its origin not to some objective factors rooted in the conditions of social and economic development, but to a hypertrophied lust for power. Passions can play an important role in history, but this substantiation of the future cannot, of course, be taken seriously. Orwell's novel not only has nothing to do with scientific forecasting. It can hardly be classified as science fiction either. His book is a poignant satire on an inhuman social order and in genre it is closest to the works of François Rabelais and Jonathan Swift. Strictly speaking, it can only be described as an anti-utopia by stretching the point a great deal.

Huxley's and Orwell's novels differ not only in philosophical depth, but also in political orientation. The former essentially puts the blame on capitalism for the distorted future. The totalitarianism in his *Brave New World* is an inevitable function of heartless technicality, without which the consumer society[1] taken to its logical conclusion would simply disintegrate. Orwell, on the other hand, makes technicality a function of totalitarianism, and the latter, fed by Napoleonic passions,

---

[1] Huxley, already in the 1930s, produced convincing evidence that modern capitalist civilisation had worked out a new way of managing society: there is no need to resort to a policy of violence, terror or hunger in order to subjugate the will and consciousness of the mass of the people to the will of the ruling elite. There are other sufficiently effective means of doing so. These means are all the more effective because, while paralysing independent thought and feeling, they leave man the illusion of freedom of choice that he needs, an illusion backed up by all possible kinds of entertainment and enjoyment.

either holds back technological progress or uses it against man.

The author of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* without any scruples puts the blame for all the nightmarish consequences of totalitarianism both on fascism and communism. In other words, Orwell actually carried over into his novel the erroneous concept of those Western political scientists who ignore the social nature of power, attach abstract self-contained meaning to it, and derive social relations from it, rather than doing the reverse.

An Attempt to Understand the Changing World!

Why did a man, who was a declared socialist, write a novel which has become one of the most actively used tools of anti-communist propaganda? I think that the reason was his fear as a bourgeois individualist of the socialisation of property, of the discipline of social life and work. Admittedly, Orwell described the system in his *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as "oligarchic collectivism", yet he distributed its vices in practically equal measure to both components of the formula.

Hostility towards "collectivism" is also strongly felt in *Brave New World*. In fact, it portrays the same barracks as in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, only thoroughly washed, scrubbed, beautified and varnished. If you think about it, you won't be able to decide at once whether it is better to be a hungry workman crushed by drudgery or a satiated and carefree nincompoop thoroughly brainwashed from birth.

So, after a considerable divergence Huxley's and Orwell's anti-utopias come together again. Both

took an incorrect view of socialism, its prospects and possibilities. Both took the relapses and recoils of the past for phenomena of the new social system, and both blamed it almost equally with the exploiter system for the distorted future—even though this was done as a warning for their contemporaries and descendants. That is why, as we have said, both English novelists have described not quite the type of society or quite a different type of society from the one they had in mind.

Indirect evidence in favour of this conclusion is the fact that, contrary to anti-communist propaganda, serious Western analysts consider *Nineteen Eighty-Four* one of those works through which Western civilisation tried to understand the changing world.

Their assessments are a credit to their intelligence and insight, but while they arrive at correct conclusions *in essence*, they ascribe to Orwell intentions quite different from those which inspired him in his work. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is, of course, an anti-Communist work, too. This is beyond question, because it transparently repeats the worn-out clichés about the "kinship" between communism and fascism.

According to a West German sociologist, Frank Rainer Scheck, the main thing for Huxley and Orwell was to avoid a dictatorship, no matter what kind, bourgeois or proletarian, and preserve the "liberal golden mean"; he believes that anti-utopias in general are a product of petty-bourgeois thinking.[1] This is probably not quite correct: both *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

[1] See F. R. Scheck, "Augenschein und Zukunft", in *Science Fiction. Theorie und Geschichte*, München, 1972, S. 270-271.

warn against totalitarianism and not dictatorship; the two are not the same thing at all. Yet it is also correct that the authors of utopian works who take either a bourgeois liberal or a petty bourgeois radical (anarchist) stand,[1] while denouncing totalitarianism and ignoring its class origin, either consciously or subconsciously cast aspersions on the concepts of dictatorship, organisation, social discipline and control *in general*.

Meanwhile, *the dictatorship of the proletariat is both anti-totalitarian and anti-elitarian in its origins and purpose*. Since the working class does not aim to perpetuate its predominant position in society, its rise to political power can have nothing to do with the whole gamut of nightmares painted by the imaginations of Huxley, Orwell and many other less talented anti-utopia writers. Government by the workers and working people inevitably assumes the form of socialist democracy and everything which runs counter to this law-governed pattern only points to the complexity of the historical process, and the tenacious power of the past, stubbornly resisting the emergence of the new world.

There is no doubt that the anti-communist overtones in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* were prompted by the violations of socialist democracy that took place in prewar years. However, to blame socialism for the violations of democracy during Stalin's personality cult in the USSR or during Mao Zedong's "cultural revolution" in China is equivalent to making capitalism responsible for the executions committed in the French Thermidor.

---

[1] Anti-utopias are also successfully used by Marxist writers to show what various negative trends may lead to if not duly resisted.

In fact, however, capitalism is responsible for other things—for millions of lives lost in the wars to divide and redivide the world, the suffering of the enslaved peoples in the colonies, the exploitation of labour, the corruption of souls with the cult of the golden calf, and many other tragic consequences of a social system based on private ownership.

It takes long and truly titanic efforts to overcome the heritage of capitalism, and until now this could only be achieved through a bitter struggle against the forces of world reaction, by trial and error, by consolidating and improving the new forms of social life to match socialist principles.

Socialism means collectivism by the very etymology of the word. Unlike Orwell's "oligarchic collectivism", however, it is *democratic collectivism* whose aim is both the equality of all and the all-round free development of each individual. It is fair to say that the establishment of a harmonious balance between the individual and the social is a major task of the revolutionary epoch we are living through now.

Take, for instance, the sphere of art. Socialism presupposes a degree of socialisation here, as in any other field. Art ceases to be a province for lone enthusiasts. In a socialist society art becomes a public concern as regards its dissemination, its "reaching" the masses, its organisation. This is a great advantage, making it possible to overcome the artist's isolation, his secluded existence in himself and for himself, which often degenerates into narcissism. Art fed by the inexhaustible springs of the people's creative endeavour becomes not a mere observer of life helping people to understand themselves and the conditions of their existence, but an influential participant in the en-

tire effort to transform society in the interests of man.

However, social influence on the shaping of art has its own limits. When they are overstepped, there is a threat that the artist may be forced to accept standardised hackneyed tastes and that his creative possibilities, in particular, his capability of discovery, may be curtailed. As Hegel once observed, truth is born as heresy and dies as prejudice. Any discovery, whether artistic or scientific, means upsetting the stereotyped views and ideas. It is impossible to create if the discoverer is not free and those around him are not tolerant of what might at first seem unacceptable because it runs counter to deep-rooted concepts and habits.

It is like that in practically every sphere of human activity. What is needed everywhere is that single optimal measure that makes it possible to organise social labour effectively, maintain reasonable discipline without any curb on individual initiative, and ensure the most favourable conditions for people's free self-expression in a collective, for creative endeavour. What is needed is harmony between the interests of man as an individual and his interests as a member of society, between the interests of a young person and his own interests in advanced age, and between the great variety of social, sectional and individual interests making up the "energy potential" of modern society.

Naturally enough, harmony in these matters, just as any other unity of opposites, is possible not as something stable but rather as *a constant pursuit of an elusive objective* similar to Faust's desire to retain a fair moment. It cannot be otherwise, because the very measure of harmony be-

tween contradictory interests is not constant. It is subject to change as a variety of factors change, first of all, the level of development of the productive forces, production relations and social consciousness.

The historical process is sometimes so complex and confused that it would hardly be fair to reproach those who in the 1930s failed to separate the seeds of the future from the weeds of the past, to see the true direction given to the progress of society by the socialist revolution. However, an error that might have been forgivable several decades ago, cannot be forgiven in our time when the objective laws of the new social system, such as the constant improvement of socialist democracy, increasing equality, and the expansion of the rights and freedoms of the individual, have revealed themselves with such vigour.

1984 the Way It Is

Let us now turn to reality. In the Soviet Union the building of a developed socialist society has created the necessary material and cultural prerequisites for rapid progress in every sphere of social life. The new Constitution of the USSR adopted in 1977 was a landmark along this road. It makes it possible to assess the changes that have taken place in the sphere of citizens' social, economic and political rights. There is no better way to follow the trend than to compare two Constitutions separated by four decades and measure the path covered from two points of view, as it were.

Both the 1936 and 1977 Constitutions declare the right to work. However, in the 1977 Constitution this right is enriched by the guaranteed op-

portunity to choose a trade or profession, type of job and work in accordance with one's inclinations, abilities, training and education, with due account, naturally, of the needs of society.

The 1936 Constitution guaranteed the right to maintenance in sickness and in the event of disability. We do not need to say how important this right is in present-day conditions, and it is now supplemented by the right to health protection ensured by a large network of clinics and hospitals, preventive and curative centres; by advanced medical science, and the pharmaceutical industry; and by one of the world's largest armies of doctors and other medical personnel.

The same process can easily be traced in the field of other social rights of Soviet citizens first proclaimed in the 1936 Constitution—the right to rest and leisure and to education. The 1977 Constitution for the first time provides for such a vital social right as the right to housing as well as the right to enjoy cultural benefits, and for freedom of scientific, technical and artistic work. The state is obliged to provide the necessary material conditions for this and support for voluntary societies and unions of workers in the arts.

The 1977 Constitution fully confirms the political freedoms recorded in the 1936 Constitution (freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly, meetings, street processions and demonstrations) and adds to them such important civil rights as the right to submit proposals to state bodies and public organisations for improving their activity, and to criticise shortcomings in their work, the right to lodge a complaint against the actions of officials, state bodies and public bodies, as well as the right to protection by the courts against en-

croachments on one's honour and reputation, life and health, and personal freedom and property.

In a bid to play down the importance of the new Soviet Constitution, bourgeois commentators expressed doubts about whether it would be consistently implemented. They pointed to the violations of socialist legality immediately after the 1936 Constitution had been adopted.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has strongly condemned violations of the principles of socialist democracy and the Leninist standards of Party and state life which occurred in connection with the personality cult. A vast amount of work has been carried out to improve Soviet legislation and create firm guarantees against the violations of citizens' rights, abuse of power and bureaucratic distortions. Strict observance of the Constitution is the duty of all state bodies and officials, public organisations and citizens.[1]

The 1977 Constitution reaffirms such principles as the electiveness of judges and people's assessors, the independence of the courts and the procurator's offices, the collegial hearing of civil and criminal cases, with proceedings open to the public (Chapters 20 and 21). Moreover, it contains a wide range of the guarantees of the inviolability of the person and the home (Articles 54 to 57); it proclaims the duty of the state and of all its bodies to function on the basis of socialist law, ensure the maintenance of law and order, and safeguard the interests of society and the rights and freedoms of citizens (Article 4).

---

[1] It is an excellent illustration of K. Marx's idea that it is not persons that must be a guarantee against laws but, on the contrary, "laws must be a guarantee against persons". (K. Marx, F. Engels, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1975, Vol. 1, p. 243).

The Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 26th CPSU Congress contains a section devoted to the further development of the Soviet political system. The important idea that runs through this section is that after the adoption of the 1977 Constitution the necessary legal prerequisites were created for the all-round development of democracy and the encouragement of initiative in every sphere of public activity. The emphasis is now being shifted to the consistent and full implementation of the principles inherent in the political system of developed socialism. This means attaining the fullest possible harmonious unity between theory and practice, between legal norms and social relations.

These are the guidelines for the development of the socialist political system. They are going to make themselves felt with increasing force in the coming decades. If we try to sum them up, the right word to use here will be democratisation.

The implementation of the plans of communist construction depends to a decisive degree on the effort and political activity of the working people. "And this means," Yuri Andropov once observed, "that there must be a further development of socialist democracy in the broadest sense, that is to say, the increasingly active participation of the masses of working people in running state and public affairs."

The processes taking place in the socialist countries are extremely varied. This is due to the different levels of economic development, the different degrees of maturity reached by the new social relations and, of course, historical traditions and specific national features. Yet movement towards expanding and deepening democracy and human rights is typical of all of them. *In other*

words, socialism is moving in a completely opposite direction to that which might lead to the nightmarish society of "Nineteen Eighty-Four", or the "brave new world". That is not the future of socialism.

But what about capitalism? Can we say that capitalist society, even though it has not come close to the society of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, has moved in that direction? I don't think there is a simple answer to this question.

Of all that mankind has experienced in its difficult history, fascist regimes came the closest to the nightmares of the anti-utopia. As a matter of fact, as has been noted, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* only moved the features of those regimes forty years ahead. When one recalls the gas chambers of Auschwitz (Oswiecim), Majdanek, the fate of Khatyn, Lidice and Oradour, one feels that Orwell was not very far removed from reality. Compared with Hitler's Third Reich, his Oceania does not seem so repulsive.

Consequently, history has already shown beyond doubt that capitalism is capable of producing that inhuman totalitarian system against which the writers of anti-utopias warn mankind. On the other hand, history has also shown that this potential does not always materialise: although fascism spread to half of Europe, it failed to get the upper hand in a number of developed capitalist countries with stable bourgeois democratic traditions which, as a matter of fact, made it possible to form the anti-Hitler coalition.

What, then, is the reason for this phenomenon, not very comprehensible at first sight? It derives from the law of the uneven development of capitalism discovered by Lenin. As a result, a revolutionary situation does not develop at the same

time in different countries. Capitalism resorts to extreme measures only when there is a direct threat to its domination. Between the two world wars this threat became tangible in Italy, Spain and Germany. The monopolies made Hitler imperial chancellor not because he appealed to them but because they saw no other way of dealing summarily with Ernst Thälmann and his party.

In other words, capitalism resorts to totalitarian methods as a direct *reaction* to a threat to its power coming from revolutionary movements. Hence the very use of the word "reaction" as a synonym for a social force hostile to the working people and its terrorist methods. However, during the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism this reaction becomes constant and not sporadic. This is the meaning of Lenin's description of imperialism's political superstructure as a turn to reaction.

Consequently, a) the last stage of capitalism shows a general trend towards the use of force to preserve the rule of monopoly capitalism as well as of the most refined methods of misleading the working people provided by the progress of science and technology; b) in those countries where such measures prove insufficient attempts are made to crush revolutionary movements with the aid of a terrorist dictatorship.

Today many well-known facts point to the crisis of the political and ideological superstructure of modern capitalism. This crisis is expressed in the trampling underfoot of bourgeois democratic legality, an increase in violence and corruption, a moral decline, etc. Nevertheless, it is of interest to take at least a cursory look at the intensity with which the features of the heartless totalitarian regime

described by Huxley and Orwell are making themselves felt now.

I must point out that I shall deal not so much with the facts themselves as with their assessment by Western theoreticians and propagandists. What is important is to find out how things are seen from "inside" the capitalist system.

One of the most characteristic features of present-day political life in capitalist countries is the steadily increasing *intervention of the state in citizens' private lives*, usually on the pretext of ensuring "national security". An American journalist, John Raines, observes in this connection that what should be a private matter comes to the attention of the authorities while what should be the subject of public interest is immersed in an atmosphere of selfish privacy and secrecy. This perversion cuts at the roots of the very idea of citizenship, turning members of society into passive inhabitants of the system, into objects of bureaucratic manipulation.

According to Raines, the bureaucratic form of organising society, which is hostile to the spirit of individual independence, has received technical support in the shape of modern computers. "Computerised society", subordinated to the anti-humane principles of profit and efficiency, becomes "transparent" to the authorities and can be "screened" in every direction. Americans today are, in a way, "prisoners of files", inhabitants of a social environment in which it is impossible to live without leaving traces. And to exist in a society becoming more and more "transparent", to be locked up in the prison of a file means to be in the field of vision and never to feel certain that one is not being watched with the aid of distorting mirrors.

The police in every American state now have a computerised information system hooked up to the central system of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The latter can gather, store and, at the right moment, produce compromising data on citizens in unlimited quantities. According to an American sociologist James F. Petras, the Washington branch of the FBI alone has compiled more than 500,000 files on groups and private citizens that have aroused either direct or "vague" suspicion among the custodians of the law.[1]

The police and the authorities, of course, do not need all those files just to send Christmas cards to Americans. Documentary material gathered by wiretapping, surveillance and, chiefly, denunciations, is effectively used in the drive to suppress dissent. The "dictatorship of files" is practised in every possible way, including outright violence when legal persecution is too difficult.

It is fair to say that the lynch law has ceased to be a tool of the racists alone. It is widely used against prominent political figures. A number of US Presidents, from Abraham Lincoln in 1865, have fallen victim to hired assassins. The American history of modern and recent times could well compete in this respect with the history of the feudal monarchies, which abounded in assassinations of sovereigns.

Needless to say, the same methods are being used even more extensively against progressives who, unlike US Presidents, have no secret service agents to guard them. Dr. Martin Luther King, Malcolm X, Medgar Evers, and many other political activists have been assassinated over the past two decades alone. The deaths of many were simply not reported, and some were described as victims

[1] *Le Monde diplomatique*, VIII (1978).

of common criminals. A report of the committee on the fulfilment of the Helsinki agreements by the US indicates that there is evidence that the FBI and the CIA use professional killers from the underworld to remove persons they do not like.

Although all Americans are subjected to general control, those social groups whose civil rights are infringed on for various reasons are kept under particularly close surveillance. According to Professor Richard M. Pious of York University, every nation has its victors and losers. In America the losers are the blacks, the Hispanics, the poor, the uneducated whites, and others locked up in urban ghettoes or scattered over the depressed rural areas. [1]

There come moments in American political life when the two leading parties, the Democrats and the Republicans, in their scramble for power lift the curtain a little on the truth about the state of affairs in the country, usually hushed up by official propaganda. Such moments come during the election campaigns. A report issued by a group of prominent Democrats in January 1984, for instance, contains many facts about economic injustice, the sorry plight of the unemployed and other downtrodden in America, the trampling upon civil rights and abuse of power.

The authors of the report note not without reason that discrimination in the field of civil rights intensified when the Republican Administration had come to power. But they prefer to say nothing about the fact that social evils are part

---

[1] See Richard M. Pious, ed., *Civil Rights and Liberties in the 1970's*, York University. Random House, New York, 1973, p. 3.

and parcel of the capitalist system, the preservation and prosperity of which is the supreme objective of both the Democrats and the Republicans.

Both parties, for instance, are responsible for the genocide of the American Indians. If the US ruling circles succeed in assimilating what is left of the tribes that were once free masters of the American land, bourgeois sociologists are sure to use some tricks to put it down to the credit of American democracy.

And it is safe to say that the CIA is engaged in global operations to export the same practice to other countries and regions of the world.

The US authorities had been compelled, under public pressure, to announce a number of restrictions on CIA subversive activities. Its operations were placed under stricter control. Under the Reagan Administration, however, in an atmosphere of anti-communist hysteria, all those formal restrictions were brushed aside. The CIA was given a free hand and official blessing to use any methods against those whom the American rulers do not like.

However, what gives cause for the greatest concern is the fact that George Orwell's gloomy forecasts about the trend of world events are beginning to come true. Despite all the negative trends in the political system of the capitalist countries, the reactionary onslaught there is opposed by strong working-class and democratic movements capable of defending civil rights and undermining the schemes to establish totalitarian dictatorships. Yet the question of war and peace is much more acute nowadays. The arms race unleashed by the imperialists has brought mankind close to a dangerous brink beyond which it may perish in a nuclear blaze. Despite the efforts of the socialist

and other peaceloving states and political forces, it has not yet been possible to stop the dangerous course of events. The deployment of American Pershing-2 and Cruise missiles in Europe, started in late 1983, compelled the Warsaw Treaty countries to take the necessary countermeasures. Military confrontation has grown. The world community entered the year 1984 with perhaps the greatest alarm since the 1962 Caribbean crisis.

US militarism is chiefly to blame for this state of affairs. Its social basis was aptly described by none other than President Eisenhower. In his farewell message in January 1961 he observed that the convergence of a huge military establishment and a massive military industry was a new phenomenon in American history and that its comprehensive influence was felt in every city, in the government bodies of every state, in every federal agency. So, he said, the Americans had to recognise the awesome consequences this had and had to act so that the military-industrial complex did not deliberately or unintentionally acquire influence on an impermissible scale. The potential possibility of disastrous increase in that unlawful power exists and will continue to exist.

The warning proved correct. The disastrous power of the military-industrial complex has manifested itself in the escalation of militarism on a monstrous scale. US military spending reached 280,000 million dollars in 1983 alone and there are plans to push it up to 1,300 thousand million dollars in the coming five years.

The monopolies specialising in arms manufacture and sales are primarily concerned about making superprofits from the war business. It is clear, however, that the arms race is being escalated not for money alone. The decisive factor is that the

ruling imperialist group has opted for a policy of strength. It is seeking to preserve US predominant positions in the capitalist world and hinder social change at all costs. So the concept of the military-industrial complex also acquires a political connotation.

The militarist drive was particularly intensified when the Reagan Administration came to power. Military allocations rose sharply. The US adopted programmes for the manufacture of MX missiles, submarines with Trident missiles on board, neutron and chemical weapons. There are plans to turn outer space, the last natural environment that might have seemed relatively safe, into a theatre of nuclear war. There has been a cascade of bellicose statements from politicians and generals reflecting the political philosophy of the hawks in the United States. One that stands out is Reagan's phrase that the potential enemy should go to sleep every night in fear that the Americans might resort to nuclear weapons. The President is not in the least perturbed by the fact that he denies sleep and chances of survival to his own fellow-countrymen, as well as to the "potential enemy".

The political madness of American big business culminated in "the crusade against communism" declared by President Reagan. It shows that American big business interests are prepared to fight to the last man on Earth to preserve their predominant positions in the world economy. It is common knowledge, however, that even as far back as the 11th century crusades were a dangerous and hopeless venture for those who started them. It is obvious to everybody what a venture of this kind may entail in a world stuffed with nuclear arms, with about four tons of explosives for every man, woman and child, and with rough parity in mili-

tary power between the two main military-political alliances of states.

Those who preach crusades are a perfect match for the political bosses of Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, not only in cruelty but also in intolerance of any dissent. Indeed, it is a fact that the ideologists of bourgeois democracy boast of pluralism, that is the plurality of centres of political power and their free competition, as the main advantage of that system. You wonder, however, how this can be compatible with the refusal to recognise the legitimate existence of states with different social and political systems or with declaring the Soviet Union "an empire of evil". Reagan holds forth about freedom, but you wonder how the idea of freethinking is compatible with a statement that the Communists are atheists and therefore cannot be regarded as civilised people in general. That is a voice from the Middle Ages. This time, however, atheists or people of a faith different from that of the US President are threatened not by cross and sword but by nuclear bombs.

However, what constitutes the summit of hypocrisy is the attempt by the present US Administration to pretend that the arms race is strengthening peace. Let us recall that in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* the key slogans were "War is Peace", "Freedom is Slavery" and "Ignorance is Strength". President Reagan has added several aphorisms of his own to Orwell's Newspeak: danger is security, buildup is reduction, death is life. This is exactly the meaning of the arguments with which the President has tried to calm his fellow-countrymen who fear that his aggressive policy might lead to a nuclear war.

It should be pointed out that the tightening of thought control and police surveillance, the situa-

tion where various social minorities are denied civil rights, growing militarism, and other phenomena reminiscent of the nightmares of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* make themselves felt in one way or another in every capitalist country. I mean here the states with stable democratic traditions, with hundreds of years of struggle for civil rights behind them and a large network of institutions set up to defend democracy. It is hardly surprising therefore that in the less developed countries within the imperialist orbit, the situation differs little from the one described by the anti-utopians. "Papa Doc" and his successor in Haiti, Pinochet in Chile and other tyrants backed up by the "world's greatest democracy", as bourgeois propagandists like to call the US, managed to "forestall" Orwell's predictions by a large margin and introduce regimes similar to that in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* in their countries long before this date.

So far we have only been speaking about violence without touching upon the broader set of issues relating to the condition and social rights of people in capitalist society. Yet there is a direct link between the two. We shall confine ourselves to quoting Bruno Kreisky, leader of the Socialist Party of Austria, who admitted that human rights are not observed in the West. "Take, for instance, the 17 million jobless," he said. "This figure does upset our small intellectual comfort, but it is a fact: we cannot provide full employment. And this is an irrefutable political argument. Doesn't past experience show that in the long run unemployment leads to the flourishing of dictatorships destroying those freedoms which we are supposed to safeguard?" [1]

[1] See *Le Figaro*, June 19, 1978.

The tendency towards authoritarian methods of rule inherent in capitalism, given a fresh impetus by the selfish use of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution, is capable of endangering the very existence of mankind. The experience of fascism proved this beyond a shadow of doubt. If fascism or any of its new modifications were to get the upper hand in the developed capitalist countries, the question of the future of the world community would have to be settled on a different basis from the present one.

But while seeing the reality of such a threat, one should also bear in mind this fact of fundamental importance: socialism, now that it has achieved a certain degree of maturity, not only negates any manifestations of the authoritarian tendency by its nature, but constitutes *the only counterbalance to that danger both on a world scale and within individual countries.*

On a world scale, socialism was the force that beat off the all-out attack by totalitarianism represented by the fascist states. (What I mean here is the Soviet Union's decisive contribution to the rout of the Nazi hordes and Japan's Kwantung Army, and the Resistance movement led by the Communists). In individual countries the task of fighting fascism was and is carried out by the working class movement defending democratic institutions and thus preventing the establishment of totalitarian dictatorships.

Forecasts, Forecasts...

Many liberal and even progressive futurologists refuse to understand the historical role of social-

ism as the system called upon to safeguard and further develop the world civilisation. A work by the American scholar Robert Sinai is a typical case in point. He criticises the policy of the American ruling circles which, guided by blind anti-communism, are trying by force and violence to retailor the world to their idea of what the way of life should be. Sinai rejects the claims of the apologists of capitalism that it is the most rational of all social systems, and observes that it breeds only irrationality and technological idiocy.

But since the American professor refuses to recognise socialism as a renewing force, his entire exposé is reduced to the banal idea of the cyclic nature of development and the next stage of decline allegedly threatening mankind. He maintains that the entire history of the human race points to the imperfection and uselessness of the values cherished by man. It shows that tension, instability and contradictions are the main conditions in which all civilisations exist and the reason for the inevitable cycles of birth, rise and fall which civilisations go through.

American Sovietologist Alfred G. Meyer, who has earned the reputation of an anti-Communist, does not object to this not very honorable title and is even proud of it. He is the author of an article entitled "An Anti-Anti-Communist Looks at Detente". What is interesting about it is that he not only acknowledges the small effect produced by blind anti-communism, he warns that it may prove disastrous for those who pin their hopes on it. Meyer observes that American democracy to a certain extent destroys itself in the name of anti-communism. The worldwide anti-communist campaign that has been going on for the last 30

years may prove to be for the US what the Sicilian expedition was to Athens or the loss of the Armada to Spain.[1]

What is the prescription for the West? It transpires that it should stick more strictly to "humanitarian" and "democratic traditions" and ... prevent any deepening of detente. It obviously does not even occur to Mr. Meyer that such a policy inevitably leads into a blind alley.

Let us now see how the future is forecast by Ossip K. Flechtheim, the man who invented the term "futurology". In his view, there are three forms the future could take: 1) there could be a slide to barbarity as the result of an all-out nuclear catastrophe and the end of the human race in the long run; 2) a neo-Caesarian civilisation of the type described in Huxley's *Brave New World*; and 3) the uniting of mankind into a world federation based on truly humanitarian principles.[2] What kind of principles these would be, socialist, capitalist or a mixture of both, is not dealt with by the forecast, if we may call such vague predictions that. Imagine a fortune-teller telling her client that he will either die or live prosperously.

Finally, let us see what the American writer and politician, Jerome Tuccille, has to say on the subject. In 1974 Tuccille ran for governor in the State of New York as a liberal. He is also a member of the World Future Society. In his book called *Who's Afraid of 1984? The Case for Optimism in*

---

[1] See B. Eissenstat, ed., *The Soviet Union: the Seventies and Beyond*, Lexington, Mass., 1975, p. 325.

[2] Ossip K. Flechtheim, *Futurologie. Der Kampf um die Zukunft*. Köln, 1981.

Looking Ahead to the 1980's [1] he emphatically refutes the predictions of a possible catastrophe whether as a result of the population explosion, the exhaustion of natural resources, great-power confrontation or from any other causes.

The facts he has gathered and his witty comments on them are of no small interest. For instance, he notes that a number of American specialists predicted in 1972 that the US Administration would be compelled to place the power industry under its control by 1977; that by 1980 there would be a massive industrial slump on the scale of 1929; that the year 1987 would be marked by a worldwide conflict over the sources of energy, capable of leading to a third world war; that by 1990 the shortage of copper would become so acute that the electrical engineering industry would collapse; that there would be practically no fresh water on earth by the year 2000; and finally, that by 2030 the ice of the North and South poles would begin to melt because of the rise in the temperature of the earth's surface, which would eventually lead to floods and an end to life. Economic upheavals would lead to the suppression of civil liberties both in the US and in the rest of the world and to the establishment of totalitarian rule everywhere.

Commenting on this doomsday scenario, Tuccille notes that things are not moving in this direction at all. His general conclusion is that as soon as a threat arises and civilisation seems to be on the verge of catastrophe, fresh possibilities open up for overcoming difficulties and for further progress.

---

[1] J. Tuccille, *Who's Afraid of 1984? The Case for Optimism in Looking Ahead to the 1980's*, Arlington House Publishers, New Rochelle, N.Y., 1975, pp. 105-106.

"Promising" that the energy crisis will have been fully resolved by 1984, Tuccille gives his own fantastic picture of the future. The economy will be dominated by multinational corporations. Since armed conflicts will not be in their interests, an everlasting peace will have been established by the late 1980's. At the same time progress in science and technology combined with private enterprise will pave the way for universal prosperity, for the ideal known as "rational hedonism", etc.

There is hardly any need to quote other prophecies which are not very serious and have long since been refuted by life. What is important here is that the book ends with an optimistic conclusion: what is in store for mankind is a kind of paradise on earth while the prophetic year 1984 will be viewed as a short-sighted fantasy.

It must be pointed out that Tuccille is not the only one to come to such a conclusion. Many Western theoreticians and journalists do not share the views of the prophets of technotyranny who believe that the world is implacably moving to the state described in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Their hopes for a more or less bearable future, however, are pinned not on socialism—much less so on its revolutionary trend, but on the scientific and technological revolution. In other words, they are trying to get rid of the technological nightmare through the rational use of technology. But how can one achieve such a degree of rationalism without encroaching on the foundations of the capitalist social order while leaving power in the hands of the monopolies and preserving private ownership and all that its domination entails? All these questions remain unanswered.

Since they cannot (or do not want to) point to the main obstacle to social progress, they cannot

(no matter how much they might want to) work out any realistic, positive programme answering the potential and needs of mankind at the junction of the second and third millennia. Impotence on the principal issue constitutes the common feature of all trends in non-Marxist social thought—of the technocrats and the anti-technocrats, of the optimists and the pessimists. In this respect there has been hardly any progress since the days of Huxley and Orwell.

After analysing bourgeois views of the future through the anti-utopian prism, we have reason to say that non-Marxist concepts of development fail completely in their attempts to understand the future. They have undoubtedly contributed to the accumulation of knowledge about various peculiarities of the path lying ahead of us all, but in view of their class narrow-mindedness they have failed to answer the question mankind has always asked itself: *Quo vadis?*

Marxism-Leninism has answered this question. The entire march of history in the 20th century shows that only progress along the path of socialism and giving full play to the democratic potential inherent in the new social order can ensure the abolition of social and national oppression, assert equality and individual freedom and finally eradicate war and solve the global problems of our time. Only in the struggle for these lofty objectives can mankind ensure a radiant future for itself.

Георгий Хосроевич Шахназаров

ЧТО ЖДЕТ ЧЕЛОВЕЧЕСТВО?

на английском языке

Цена 25 коп.

WHAT'S IN STORE FOR MANKIND

Georgi SHAKHNAZAROV, D. Sc. (Law), winner of the USSR State Prize, is President of the Soviet Political Science Association and first Vice-President of the International Political Science Association. He is the author of *Socialism and Equality, Communism and the Freedom of the Individual, The Bourgeois State in the Epoch of Imperialism, Socialist Democracy, The Socialist Destiny of Mankind, Futurology Fiasco, The Future World Order* and *Socialism and the Future*.